IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TREMONT REALTY CAPITAL, INC.,

Plaintiff,

MAGISTRATE JUDGE Alexander

v.

PINNACLE GROUP, LLC, ADAMS CANYON RANCH, LLC, JOHN LANG, and MICHAEL GRADY,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. _

RECEIPT #_____ AMOUNT \$_____

SUMMONS ISSUED (C)

LOCAL RULE 4.1_ WAIVER FORM___

MCF ISSUED_

BY DPTY, CLK. 1-0.1-DATE 8/25/04

COMPLAINT

Introduction

1. This action for breach, unjust enrichment, fraud and unfair and deceptive practices arises out of an agreement by Pinnacle Group, LLC, Adams Canyon Ranch, LLC, John Lang, and Michael Grady (collectively, the "Defendants") to pay a brokerage fee to Plaintiff Tremont Realty Capital, Inc. ("Tremont") in the event that the Defendants obtained financing, from any source, for a real estate development project known as The Ranch at Santa Paula located in Ventura County, California (the "Project"). Such financing was obtained and a brokerage fee in the amount of \$830,000 is due Tremont.

Parties

- 2. Tremont is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located at 800 Boylston Street, Suite 401, Boston, Massachusetts.
 - 3. Pinnacle Group, LLC ("Pinnacle") is an Arizona limited liability company with

its principal place of business located at 8145 North 86th Street, Scottsdale, Arizona.

- 4. Adams Canyon Ranch, LLC ("Adams Canyon") is an Arizona limited liability company with its principal place of business located at 8145 North 86th Street, Scottsdale, Arizona.
- 5. John Lang is an individual residing in Scottsdale, Arizona. Lang is the manager of Pinnacle.
- 6. Michael Grady is an individual residing in Scottsdale, Arizona. Grady is the CFO of Pinnacle and the manager of Santa Paula Development Partners, LLC, which is the manager of Adams Canyon.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the parties are organized under the laws of and maintain their principal places of business in different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of interests and costs.
- 8. Venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this judicial district.

Facts

- 9. On August 30, 2003, Tremont and the Defendants entered into a Mortgage Banking Agreement (the "Agreement"). A true and accurate copy of the Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 10. Prior to entering into the Agreement, the parties negotiated the terms of the Agreement over several months. Those negotiations took place primarily during telephone calls between the Defendants and representatives of Tremont located in Boston, Massachusetts.

- 11. According to the Agreement, the Defendants "grant[ed] Tremont the exclusive right to procure or arrange the subject financing" for a project known as The Ranch at Santa Paula located in Ventura County, California (the "Project"). See Agreement at Paragraph 1.
- 12. According to the Agreement, the Defendants agreed to pay Tremont "a fee equal to one percent (1%) of the maximum loan amount of any senior debt financing, 3% of any mezzanine or 5% of any equity capital that is committed on the Project." See Agreement at Paragraph 4.
- 13. Tremont's exclusive right to procure or arrange financing for the Project was subject to the exception that if the Defendants obtained financing from a source listed on Appendix 1 to the Agreement, Tremont would not earn the agreed-upon brokerage fee, but rather would earn only a breakup fee of \$25,000. See Agreement at Paragraph 5.
- 14. The sources listed on Appendix 1 to the Agreement are Funding America, Sion Holdings, and Old Standard Life. A true and accurate copy of Appendix 1 to the Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 15. Following execution of the Agreement, Tremont introduced the Defendants to Fidelity Management & Research Company ("Fidelity") as a funding source for the Project.
- 16. In 2003 and 2004, Tremont, Fidelity and the Defendants negotiated the terms under which Fidelity would provide financing to the Project. Those negotiations took place primarily during telephone calls among the Defendants, representatives of Tremont located in Boston, Massachusetts, and representatives of Fidelity located in Boston, Massachusetts.
- 17. Fidelity ultimately committed to provide the Defendants with \$16,600,000 in equity financing for the Project subject to the execution of an appropriate financing agreement and related documentation.

- 18. In the months leading up to July, 2004, Tremont, Fidelity and the Defendants engaged in negotiations concerning the terms of a financing agreement.
- 19. Fidelity and the Defendants had each retained counsel to assist in negotiating and documenting the terms of a final financing agreement.
- 20. As of July, 2004, counsel for Fidelity and the Defendants were in the process of exchanging drafts of a financing agreement and related documentation by which Fidelity would provide the Defendants with \$16,600,000 in equity financing for the Project.
- Defendants represented to Tremont and Fidelity that they were not engaged in discussions with any potential financing source other than Fidelity and those lenders named on Appendix 1 to the Agreement. At the time Defendants made this representation, upon information and belief, they were engaged in discussions with potential lending source(s) other than Fidelity and those lenders named on Appendix 1 to the Agreement.
- 22. In July, 2004, the Defendants secured financing for the Project with another lender and ceased all negotiations with Fidelity and Tremont.
- 23. On July 26, 2004, Tremont made demand upon the Defendants to pay a brokerage fee equal to 5% of the \$16,600,000 in equity financing that Fidelity had committed to the Project. A true and accurate copy of the July 26, 2004 correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit C.
- 24. On July 27, 2004, the Defendants rejected Tremont's demand that it be paid the agreed-upon brokerage fee. A true and accurate copy of the July 27, 2004 correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

COUNT I (Breach of Contract)

- 25. Tremont hereby realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 24 above.
- 26. The Defendants have breached the Agreement by wrongfully refusing and failing to perform their obligations under that agreement, specifically their failure to pay the brokerage fee in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Agreement.
- 27. Tremont has performed all conditions precedent to its right to collect the brokerage fee.
 - 28. The Defendants' conduct has caused and continues to cause damage to Tremont.

COUNT II(Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

- 29. Tremont hereby realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 28 above.
- 30. The Agreement contains an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
- 31. The Defendants are in breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing contained in the Agreement.
 - 32. The Defendants' conduct has caused and continues to cause damage to Tremont.

COUNT III (Unjust Enrichment)

- 33. Tremont hereby realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 32 above.
- 34. The Defendants have been unjustly enriched by their retention of benefits received in connection with Tremont's performance of its obligations under the Agreement and their refusal to pay Tremont its brokerage fee.
 - 35. The Defendants' conduct has caused and continues to cause damage to Tremont.

COUNT IV (Fraud)

- 36. Tremont hereby realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 35 above.
- 37. The Defendants' misrepresentations that they were not in discussions with potential financing sources other than Fidelity and those lenders named on Appendix 1 to the Agreement constitute false statements of fact and were known to the Defendants to be false when made or were made with reckless disregard for their truth or falsity.
- 38. The Defendants intended to and did induce Tremont to reasonably rely on their representations as outlined herein to its detriment.
 - 39. The Defendants' conduct has caused and continues to cause damage to Tremont.

COUNT IV Acts and Practices under M.C.I.

- (Unfair and Deceptive Acts and Practices under M.G.L. c. 93A)
- 40. Tremont hereby realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 39 above.
- 41. The Defendants are engaged in trade or commerce within the meaning of Mass.

 Gen. L. c. 93A, § 1.
- 42. The actions of the Defendants were calculated to obtain the benefits provided by Tremont under the Agreement without having to provide Tremont with the consideration promised under the Agreement.
- 43. The actions of the Defendants as alleged herein constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in violation of Mass. Gen. L. c. 93A, §§ 2 & 11.
- 44. The unfair and deceptive acts committed by the Defendants were knowing and willful.
 - 45. The Defendants' conduct has caused and continues to cause damage to Tremont.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Tremont Realty Capital, Inc. respectfully requests that this

Court:

- enter judgment in Tremont's favor and against the Defendants on count I of the a Complaint and award damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact;
- enter judgment in Tremont's favor and against the Defendants on count II of the [b] Complaint and award damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact;
- enter judgment in Tremont's favor and against the Defendants on count III of the c Complaint and award damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact;
- enter judgment in Tremont's favor and against the Defendants on count IV of the [d] Complaint and award damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact;
- award Tremont three times its compensatory and consequential damages for the [e] Defendants' knowing and willful violations of G.L. c. 93A;
- award Tremont its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs due to Defendants' f violations of M.G.L. c. 93A; and
- [g] award Tremont such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Tremont Realty Capital, Inc. hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable.

TREMONT REALTY CAPITAL, INC.

By its attorneys,

James M. Wodarski, BBO# 627036

David Hadas, BBO #641294

JH in

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.

One Financial Center

Boston, MA 02111

(617) 542-6000

Dated: August 25, 2004

FECEFT# _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP

MAG LINGE

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS=44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service or pleadings or other papers as required by law except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the us-

of the Clerk of Court for the						iber 1914, is required for the us-				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
TREMONT REALTY	CAPITAL, INC.			PINNACLE GROUP JOHN LANG and M	LLC, ADAMS CANYON INCHAEL GRADY	RANCH, LLC,				
44.)					J. T.					
(b) 10unty of Residence (Suffolk			F FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT					
(EXCEP	T IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	SEO)		1 200 21	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE MNATION CASES USE THE LOF INVOLVED.	•				
	OHN FERRIS GLOVSKY CENTER, BOSTON, M	AND POPEO PO	 	ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)	CIDAL DADDEC					
II. BASIS OF JUNISD	ICTION PLACE AND	X IN C SECX ONLY)		Diversity Cases Only)		LACE AN "X" IN DNE BCX FOR PLAINTF HND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)				
C US Government	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			PTF DEF Ontizen of This State 1 Incomporated or Principal Place 4 14 of Business In This State						
E 2 U.S Government Defendant	,			Critizen of Another State						
				Citizen or Subject of a □ Foreign Country	3 D 3 Foreign Natio	DU □ € □ €				
	T (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE									
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY		OTHER STATUTES				
110 Insurance 120 Manne 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment 2 Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted 3.Loent Loans Ect Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 310 Airculane ☐ 362 Personal Injur ☐ 315 Airculane Product Urability ☐ 365 Personal Injur ☐ 320 Assault Libe & Product Liability		ury — G20 Other = ⊃od & Drug actice — G25 Drug = Heated Serzure of Property 21 USC 881 bility — G30 Liquor Laws ersonal — G40 R R 3 i Truck ict Liability — G50 Autine = Regs — G60 Occue=stronal — Safery ← ealth — G90 Other		422 Apcieal 28 USC 156 423 Withdrawa-28 USC 15 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Codyngms 830 Pattern 840 Trademark	□ 400 State: Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Barnics and Banking □ 450 Commerce:/CC Rates etc □ 460 Desciritation □ 470 Rabiveteer Influenced and Comust Organizations □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securmes/Commodities/Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge				
	350 Matter Venice	☐ 380 Other Perso Property Da	onal .	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	12 LSC 3415				
2 190 Imer Contract 195 Stritract Product Liability	Product Lability 360 Other Persona Injury	☐ 385 Property Da Product Lia	amage	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor Mgmt. Relations	☐ 861 HIA 1395ff ☐ 862 Black Lung 923) ☐ 863 DIW/C/DIW# (405(g)	B91 Agricultural Acts B92 Economic Stabilization Act B93 Environmental Matters				
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PE		☐ 730 Labor:™gmt. Reporting	☐ 864 SSiC Title XA ☐ 865 RSi -405(g	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act				
	442 Emcioymert	Sentence HABEAS CORP		& Discrosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	900 Apcieal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justics				
240 Firs to Land 245 Firt Product Liability 290 Al Other Real Property	443 Housing Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Pena ☐ 540 Mandamus ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Phson Con	ulty & Other	☐ 790 Other _abor Utigation ☐ 791 Empi Ret. Inc. Security Act	☐ 870 Taxæs (U.S. Raintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS — Thru Party 26 JSC 7629	☐ 950 Constitutionality of State: Statutes ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions				
Proceeding State	Court Appe	·	AN "X" IN (A Reinsta Reoper							
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N (CITE THE US DWLSTA' DO NOT DITE LURISDIC' Section 1332	TUTE UNDER WHICH TIONAL STATUTES UN	YOU ARE FI ILESS DIVER	LING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEME ISITY.)	NT OF CAUSE					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER FR.C.P. 2:		TION .	DEMAND \$ 830,000 plus in plus t	terest	only if demainded in complaint				
VIII.RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions):	IDGE			DOCKET NUMBER					
DATE		SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNE 3	F RECORD						
8/25/04		T) _	J 1							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY										

Case 1:04-cv-11853-RGS Decument 3. Justiled 08/25/2004 Page 9 of 9 district of Massachusett

	GORY IN	WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERE	D NATURE OI	SUIT CO	ODE LIST	ED ON THE	
CIVIL	COVER S	SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).					
	L	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.					
	IL	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820°, 830°, 840°, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.		o complete AO 120 or AO 121 patent, trademark or copyright case			
<u>X</u>	HI.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.			Q.	ÇS	
	rv.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.	119	5	5		
	v.	150, 152, 153.	. 1	J -			
TITLE	AND NUI	MBER, IF ANY, OF RELATED CASES. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.	.1(E)).				
HAS A		CTION BETWEEN THE SAME PARTIES AND BASED ON THE	E SANIL CLAII YES	m ever	BEEN FIL	ED IN THIS	
					,		
		IPLAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTION THE CONSTITUTIONALI		т оғ со П		AFFECTING :	
		ST? (SEE 28 USC 2403) .S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S	YES		NO	lei	
			YES		NO		
IS THE	S CASE R	EQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRIC	T COURT OF	THREE J	UDGES P	URSUANT TO	
	28 USC 2		YES		NO	Ø	
DO AL	<u>l</u> partie	S IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF	THE DISTRIC	T OF MA	ASSACHU	SETTS	
(WOR	ESTER C	OUNTY) - (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(C)).	YES		NO	M	
OR IN	THE WES	TERN SECTION (BERKSHIRE, FRANKLIN, HAMPDEN OR H	IAMPSHIRE C	OUNTIES)? -		
(SEE L	OCAL RU	(LE 40.1(D)).	YES		NO	(24)	
DO AL	L OF TH	PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE	CENTRAL AN	(D/OR W	ESTERN :	SECTIONS OF	
	ISTRICT		YES		NO	M	
THE D	IF YES	, IN WHICH SECTION DOES THE PLAINTIFF RESIDE?					
THE D		TION De 📑 ONLY PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSET	TTS RESIDE!_	E45+	ern		
(a)	ICH SEC				30 4 NW C	GOVERNMEN	
(a) IN WH IF AN	Y OF THE	PARTIES ARE THE UNITED STATES, COMMONWEALTH O IE U.S.A. OR THE COMMONWEALTH, DO ALL OTHER PART	OF MASSACHU TIES RESIDE I	ISETTS, (IN THE	JK ANT C		
(a) IN WH IF ANT AGEN	Y OF THE	PARTIES ARE THE UNITED STATES, COMMONWEALTH OF IE U.S.A. OR THE COMMONWEALTH, DO ALL OTHER PARTICIPATE OR WESTERN SECTION.	TIES RESIDE	ISETTS, C IN THE	NO NO	M	
(a) IN WH IF ANT AGENC CENTI	Y OF THE CY OF TE RAL SECT	IE U.S.A. OR THE COMMONWEALTH, DO ALL OTHER PART TIGHT YES INO MO OR WESTERN SECT	TIES RESIDE	IN THE		Ø	
(a) IN WH IF ANY AGENC CENTI	Y OF THE	IE U.S.A. OR THE COMMONWEALTH, DO ALL OTHER PART FIGHT YES NO MO OR WESTERN SECT PRINT)	TIES RESIDE : TION; YES	IN ТНЕ	NO		